

# North Carolina Association of Regional Councils of Government

## ORGANIZATION OVERVIEW AND IMPACT

### 1. MISSION & PROGRAMS

There are 16 regional councils with their individual mission statements. The following Mission Statement is for the collective body of regional councils in North Carolina.

*Our mission is to provide “creative regional solutions” to relevant and emerging issues in North Carolina while providing a standard of excellence in the delivery of federal, state and regional services for our member communities.*

The programs vary according to the region and its needs. However, the following list represents the broad categories of services provided to local governments across the state:

- Aging programs
- Workforce development programs
- Transportation planning (RPO & MPO)
- Community and economic development planning services
- County and municipal planning services
- Grant writing and administration
- Capacity-building services
- State and federal program management
- GIS mapping services
- Regional collaboration, partnership building and local government facilitation
- Small business/entrepreneurial assistance
- Local government technical assistance

### 2. CUSTOMER/ TARGET POPULATION

All units of local government and their citizens in North Carolina

### 3. ORGANIZATION INCEPTION

Regional councils in North Carolina are the result of **1968** federal legislation (A-95 Clearinghouse Review Process-Intergovernmental Cooperation Act) that charged the North Carolina Department of Administration with developing . . .”**a system of multi-county regional planning districts to cover the entire state” (GS 143-341) to reduce duplication of governmental services.**

Regional councils have been formally operating in the state since **1972**. However, many were organized locally long before the official state designation.

4. **FOOTPRINT**

The State of North Carolina

5. **BUDGET**

The total budget of the 16 councils collectively in 2011-12 was \$178.5 Million. **For the purpose of this report we are addressing the Technical Assistance Funds (\$328,000) received by each regional council (\$21,449).**

6. **SALARY COMPLIANCE**

The salaries of 4 directors (in the urban areas) are in excess of \$120,000. **None of the state funds are being used to pay any portion of the salaries of the Executive Directors.**

7. **LOBBYING SERVICES**

Ridgetop Management, Inc. D/B/A Ridgetop Associates: David Huskins; Betty Huskins \$2,500 for lobbying expense for 2012 (These are non-state dollars).

There are no employees or contracted agents within the 16 COGs for lobbying purposes.

8. **KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

The COGs are evaluated by their individual Boards of Directors, made up of local, elected officials, each year. The member governments of each COG make a decision each year to pay a membership fee based on their performance.

The Key Performance Indicators for the Technical Assistance Funds (\$328,000) are as follows:

1. Grants and/or funding received directly as a result of the assistance
2. Infrastructure plans and projects completed as a result of the assistance

**ROI for the \$328,000 in 2012 has been \$740.00 for each state dollar spent.**

**State Funds \$328,00**

**Leveraged Funds: \$242,822,000**

STATE FUNDING	FY 2007-08 - \$943,200	FY 2008-09 - \$718,160	FY 2009-10 - \$380,000	FY 2010-11- \$366,688
AGGREGATED TOTAL	54,866,215	124,509,345	318,651,836	587,204,361
ROI	\$58 to \$1	\$173 to \$1	\$839 to \$1	\$1,601 to 1

9. **SIMILAR ORGANIZATIONS**

There are no similar organizations. The regional councils were created by the NC General Assembly to reduce duplication of governmental services (GS 143-141)

## **10. BUDGETARY IMPACT**

*How have these reductions affected your agency and what measures did you take to mitigate these reductions?*

The technical assistance funds have been reduced approximately 65% over the past six years. **Although all units of local government have been affected, in particular, the distressed and smaller local government have been negatively impacted.**

The ability of the COGs has been limited in providing the necessary technical assistance or planning, procuring and managing grants, providing management assistance as well as their capacity for providing community planning and economic development strategy work. In addition, the ability to have these funds for leveraging (local match) federal and private monies has been decreased.

The reductions have been mitigated by reducing the level of services to counties and municipalities that do not have the resources to pay for their grant writing, planning, etc.

*Have you been able to generate resources other than state appropriations?*

The regional councils have always generated substantial outside revenue from member government dues, contracted services and as the delivery agent for local, state and federal programs.

*If not, why not?*

N/A

What would happen if the NER Committee implemented a goal of making everyone self-supporting within a certain period of time or if the NER implemented a policy of no longer funding “on-going” operations on a recurring basis, but rather funding program specific initiatives with reimbursement tied to achieving specific goals?

As stated before, the regional councils are already self-supporting because they generate alternative revenues. Loss of these funds will directly impact the smaller units of government, causing them to continue to slip between the cracks of economic stability increasing the divide between rural and urban North Carolina.

The regional councils would support the NER Committee choosing to fund only targeted programmatic initiatives. The Technical Assistance Funds are already set aside for assisting the local governments that cannot help themselves. Receiving this funding is not about funding COGs, it is about assisting small units of government in a cost effective manner for the State of North Carolina.